APPEAL NO. 020826 FILED MAY 22, 2002

	This a	ppeal a	rises p	ursuai	nt to the	e Texa	as Wo	orkers' C	comper	nsation A	ct, TE	X. LAB
CODE	E ANN.	§ 401	.001 e	t seq.	(1989	Act).	A c	ontested	d case	hearing	was	held or
Februa	ary 26,	2002.	The he	earing	officer	found	that t	he respo	ondent	(claiman	t) was	s injured
on			, and I	had di	sability	from	this	injury fr	om			through
Augus	st 14, 20	001.										_

The appellant (self-insured) appeals that there was no evidence of "injury" and that the claim was only filed when vacation time was refused. There is no response from the claimant.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in his determinations concerning a compensable injury and resultant disability. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the relevance, materiality, weight, and credibility of the evidence presented at the hearing. Section 410.165(a). The decision should not be set aside because different inferences and conclusions may be drawn upon review, even when the record contains evidence that would lend itself to different inferences. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). A claimant's testimony alone may establish that an injury has occurred, and disability has resulted from it. Houston Independent School District v. Harrison, 744 S.W.2d 298, 299 (Tex. App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1987, no writ). It has been held that strains, sprains, wrenches, and twists that arise out of employment, even where an employee is predisposed to such injury, are compensable. Hanover Insurance Company v. Johnson, 397 S.W.2d 904 (Tex. Civ. App.-Waco 1965, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

An appeals-level body is not a fact finder and does not normally pass upon the credibility of witnesses or substitute its own judgment for that of the trier of fact, even if the evidence would support a different result. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania v. Soto, 819 S.W.2d 619, 620 (Tex. App.-El Paso 1991, writ denied); American Motorists Insurance Co. v. Volentine, 867 S.W.2d 170 (Tex. App.-Beaumont 1993, no writ). The record in this case presented conflicting evidence for the hearing officer to resolve. In considering all the evidence in the record, we cannot agree that the findings of the hearing officer are so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be manifestly wrong and unjust. In re King's Estate, 150 Tex. 662, 244 S.W.2d 660 (1951). We therefore affirm the decision and order.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is (a self-insured governmental entity) and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

SUPERINTENDENT (ADDRESS) (CITY), TEXAS (ZIP CODE).

	Susan M. Kelley Appeals Judge
CONCUR:	
Gary L. Kilgore Appeals Judge	
Thomas A. Knapp Appeals Judge	